

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FI | LING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|--|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/933,691 | 08/21/2001 | | Nobuaki Ema | 10830-074001 | 6398 |
| 26211 | 7590 | 07/13/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| FISH & RI | | | STOCK JR, GORDON J | | |
| | 45 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 2800 NEW YORK, NY 10111 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | -, -:: | | | 2877 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | ~\X |
|--|--|--|------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | 4.3 |
| Office Action Summan | 09/933,691 | EMA, NOBUAKI | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Gordon J Stock | 2877 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicati () (35 U.S.C. § 133). | ion. |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 Ju | une 2004. | | |
| · _ · | action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E | nce except for formal matters, pr | | is |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to the application of the application and so the application a | wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. | Examiner. | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob | ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121 | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. Is have been received in Application in the second | ion No ed in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | | |
| Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other: | Patent Application (PTO-152) | |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rabinski (6,480,651).

As for **claims 1 and 5**: Rabinski in a method and apparatus for aligning optical components discloses the following: a measurement unit (Fig. 3: 90) comprising a plurality of detectors and power meters (Fig. 3: 72 and 74; col. 6, lines 50-60); a first optical fiber and a second optical fiber and position controller whereby the optical component under test has a plurality of output terminals (see Fig. 3: 34, 30, 40, 50, 80); whereas, a maximum signal is detected (col. 8, lines 28-42). Secondary fibers are connected to the detectors from a switch mechanism (see Fig. 3: 76, 72, 74), and they are coupled to measurement unit that comprises a display device (Fig. 3: 90).

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Application/Control Number: 09/933,691

Art Unit: 2877

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Page 3

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's disclosure of prior related art in view of Pan (5,754,721) and further in view of Wada et al. (JP 01025109 A) and Chauvin et al. (5,889,586).

As to claim 1, the applicant's disclosure teaches prior art apparatus comprising: a measurement unit for measuring an optical output signal output from the optical component (Fig. 3, 104 and 106 of applicant's disclosure); a first optical fiber which is connected to an input terminal of the optical component under test and inputs the measurement optical signal to the optical component (Fig. 3, 102 of applicant's disclosure); a second optical fiber which is connected to an output terminal of the optical component under test and transfers, to the measurement unit, an optical output signal output from the optical component under test (Fig. 3, 103 of applicant's disclosure); a position controller for adjusting relative positions between the first optical fiber, second optical fiber, and connective sections of the optical component such that insertion loss becomes a minimum (page 2 of applicant's disclosure). Applicant's disclosure is silent concerning the positioning to a maximum signal but discloses in prior art that there is positioning until insertion loss is minimized. And Pan in a fiberoptic connector teaches that a minimum insertion loss means a maximum signal transfer (col. 2, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time to adjust the positions until the signal becomes a maximum because connections are adjusted until minimum insertion loss occurs which is equivalent to having a maximum signal transfer achieved.

Art Unit: 2877

In addition, applicant's disclosure teaches the optical component has a plurality of output terminals, a plurality of secondary optical fibers, measurement fibers, and measurement equipment (power meters) or may comprise just one power meter (page 3; lines 1-6 of applicant's disclosure). Applicant's disclosure of prior related art is silent concerning a plurality of photodetectors that are coupled to the secondary optical fibers that are connected to a measurement unit via a switch. However, Wada in an alignment device for optical waveguides teaches coupling a plurality of secondary optical fibers to a multichannel detector that has switchable means to switch between channels for measuring individual channels by the power meter (abstract and Fig. 1: 44, 54, 56). And Chauvin in a photodetection system teaches that multichannel detectors comprise a plurality of detectors (col. 1, lines 9-15). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have the system comprise a plurality of photodetectors, multichannel detector, coupled to the multiple output terminals via secondary optical fibers and have a switch in order to have a single power meter be able to measure alignment at each individual channel of the optical component under test comprising multiple channels, output terminals.

As for a display unit: they are silent, but display units are well known in the art for displaying data collected. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to have a display unit in order to display measurements obtained by the measurement unit.

As to **claim 5**, the applicant's disclosure teaches a prior related art method comprising: inputting a measurement optical signal to the optical component under test by way of a first optical fiber connected to an input terminal of the optical component under test; transmitting an optical signal output from the measurement optical component by way of a second optical fiber

Art Unit: 2877

connected to an output terminal of the optical component under test; measuring an optical output signal output from the optical component under test on the basis of the optical output signal transmitted by way of the second optical fiber; adjusting relative positions between the first and second optical fibers and connections of the optical component under test such that insertion loss is minimized (Fig. 3 and page 2 of applicant's disclosure). Applicant's disclosure is silent concerning the positioning to a maximum signal but discloses in prior art that there is positioning until insertion loss is minimized. And Pan in a fiberoptic connector teaches that a minimum insertion loss means a maximum signal transfer (col. 2, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time to adjust the positions until the signal becomes a maximum because connections are adjusted until minimum insertion loss occurs which is equivalent to having a maximum signal transfer achieved.

In addition, applicant's disclosure teaches the optical component has a plurality of output terminals, a plurality of secondary optical fibers, measurement fibers, and measurement equipment (power meters) or may comprise just one power meter (page 3; lines 1-6 of applicant's disclosure). Applicant's disclosure of prior related art is silent concerning a plurality of photodetectors that are coupled to the secondary optical fibers that are connected to a measurement unit via a switch. However, Wada in an alignment device for optical waveguides teaches coupling a plurality of secondary optical fibers to a multichannel detector that has switchable means to switch between channels for measuring individual channels by the power meter (abstract and Fig. 1: 44, 54, 56). And Chauvin in a photodetection system teaches that multichannel detectors comprise a plurality of detectors (col. 1, lines 9-15). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have the system

comprise a plurality of photodetectors, multichannel detector, coupled to the multiple output terminals via secondary optical fibers and have a switch in order to have a single power meter be able to measure alignment at each individual channel of the optical component under test comprising multiple channels, output terminals.

As for a display unit: they are silent, but display units are well known in the art for displaying data collected. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to have a display unit in order to display measurements obtained by the measurement unit.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, in view of the Rabinski reference (previously cited) Examiner apologizes for the inconvenience, but upon further consideration Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) (see above) and the Examiner requires a translation of the foreign priority papers to overcome the rejection in relation to the Rabinski reference if the foreign priority papers are the sole reliance by which the applicant wishes to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection.

Fax/Telephone Numbers

If the applicant wishes to send a fax dealing with either a proposed amendment or a discussion with a phone interview, then the fax should:

- 1) Contain either a statement "DRAFT" or "PROPOSED AMENDMENT" on the fax cover sheet; and
 - 2) Should be unsigned by the attorney or agent.

Art Unit: 2877

This will ensure that it will not be entered into the case and will be forwarded to the examiner as quickly as possible.

Papers related to the application may be submitted to Group 2800 by Fax transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 2800 via the PTO Fax machine located in Crystal Plaza 4. The form of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CP4 Fax Machine number is: (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gordon J. Stock whose telephone number is (571) 272-2431. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00 a.m. - 6:30 p.m.

July 7, 2004

ndra V. Smith rimary Examiner

Art Unit 2877